

**NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICE  
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY INCENTIVES PROGRAM  
DROUGHT RECOVERY INITIATIVE  
APPLICATION EVALUATION RANKING TOOL—STATE AND LOCAL QUESTIONS**

| State Ranking Questions—400 total points possible  | 2013 Points |
|--|-------------|
| 1. Answer the following question if the application is for development of a Conservation Activity Plan (CAP). The agency will assign significant ranking priority and conservation benefit by answering “Yes” to the following question. Answering “Yes” to the following question will result in the application being awarded the maximum amount of points that can be earned for the state priority category. |             |
| Is the program application to support the development of a CAP? If answer is “Yes,” do not answer any other state level questions. If the answer is “No,” proceed with evaluation to address the remaining questions in this section.  | 400         |
| 2. Answer the following question related to resource concerns:   |             |
| Unit of concern has resource concerns of Plant Condition—Productivity, Health, and Vigor and/or Plant Condition—Noxious and Invasive Plants.   | 50          |
| 3. If applicable, answer ONE of the following questions related to the amount of rest to be provided by your planned grazing system. If none apply, leave the answers “NO” (maximum of 150 points):  |             |
| a) The planned grazing system will provide rest for greater than 91 percent of the days during the growing season.   | 150         |
| b) The planned grazing system will provide rest no more than 90.9 percent and no less than 86 percent of the days during the growing season.   | 125         |
| c) The planned grazing system will provide rest no more than 85.9 percent and no less than 82 percent of the days during the growing season.   | 100         |
| d) The planned grazing system will provide rest no more than 81.9 percent and no less than 74 percent of the days during the growing season.   | 75          |
| e) The planned grazing system will provide rest no more than 73.9 percent and no less than 49 percent of the days during the growing season.   | 50          |
| f) The planned grazing system will provide rest no more than 48.9 percent and no less than 30 percent of the days during the growing season.   | 25          |

|    |  |    |
|----|--|----|
| 4. | If applicable, answer ONE of the following questions related to tamarisk (salt cedar) or sericea lespedeza infestation. If none apply, leave the answers "NO" (maximum of 50 points):  |    |
| a) | Agricultural land is infested with up to 10 percent of tamarisk (salt cedar) or sericea lespedeza and the producer will implement a plan to control these species.   | 50 |
| b) | Agricultural land is infested with no more than 20 percent and no less than 10.1 percent of tamarisk (salt cedar) or sericea lespedeza and the producer will implement a plan to control these species.  | 40 |
| c) | Agricultural land is infested with no more than 30 percent and no less than 20.1 percent of tamarisk (salt cedar) or sericea lespedeza and the producer will implement a plan to control these species.  | 30 |
| 5. | If applicable, answer ALL of the following questions related to at risk species. If none apply leave, the answers "NO" (maximum 30 points):  |    |
| a) | Any part of the unit of concern is located within a terrestrial at-risk species habitat area or the Bobwhite Quail Initiative areas <b>and</b> treatment of the resource concern will have a direct benefit to the terrestrial at-risk species habitat or bobwhite quail habitat. Only bobwhite quail or terrestrial species identified for this ranking category on the Statewide At-Risk Species Listing are eligible for this resource concern.<br><b>Reference:</b><br><a href="http://www.ks.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/eqip/2013/criteria.html">http://www.ks.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/eqip/2013/criteria.html</a> | 10 |
| b) | Any part of the unit of concern is located in a Greater Prairie-Chicken (GPC) or Lesser Prairie-Chicken (LPC) priority habitat area that has at least a medium or greater woody canopy infestation level for targeted undesirable species as indicated in the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) electronic Field Office Technical Guide (eFOTG) Brush Management specification. The producer will implement a plan that meets the NRCS eFOTG requirements to benefit GPC or LPC.   | 15 |
| c) | Any part of the unit of concern is located within a GPC or LPC priority habitat area and the plan will meet the NRCS eFOTG species habitat requirements.   | 5  |
| 6. | Answer the following question related to brush infestation:  |    |
|    | The grazing unit is infested with a brush species at the medium priority level as indicated in the NRCS eFOTG for brush management and the producer will implement a plan to control the brush species.  | 5  |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 7. Answer the following question related to the enrolling in the Community Collaborative Rain, Hail and Snow Network (CoCoRaHS) program.   |     |
| In assessing drought impacts and monitoring climate change, applicants will enroll in the Kansas CoCoRaHS program or a precipitation monitoring program similar which includes a 4-inch in height rain gauge to closely monitor moisture received on the ranch or enterprise. Producers agree to provide recorded precipitation information to the NRCS, if requested. | 5   |
| 8. Drought Monitor—Two-year average drought monitor condition from March 1, 2011, through March 12, 2013 (maximum of 110 points).  |     |
| a) Greater than or equal to 50 percent of the unit of concern is located in the two year average drought monitor condition of D3—Drought Extreme.  | 110 |
| b) Greater than or equal to 50 percent of the unit of concern is located in the two-year average drought monitor condition of D2—Drought Severe.   | 85  |
| c) Greater than or equal to 50 percent of the unit of concern is located in the two-year average drought monitor condition of D1—Drought Moderate.   | 65  |

| <b>Local Ranking Questions—250 total points possible</b>   | <b>2013 Points</b> |
|--|--------------------|
| 1. Is the program application to support the development of a CAP? If answer is “Yes,” do not answer any other local level questions. If the answer is “No,” proceed with evaluation to address the remaining questions in this section. | 250                |
| 2. Application includes at least one practice with a lifespan of 10 years or greater, as documented in the eFOTG.  | 20                 |
| 3. Conservation practices are scheduled to be completed within four years.   | 20                 |
| 4. Participant requested a conservation plan for this application prior to August 31, 2012.  | 40                 |
| 5. Application was deferred from a previous funding period in the Program Contracts System (ProTracts).  | 40                 |
| 6. If applicable, where livestock are wintered on grazing land where perennial streams are located, plan of operations will remove livestock access to the streams.  | 30                 |
| 7. Unit of concern contains 50 percent or greater expired or expiring Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) land and will be used for grazing or haying purposes.   | 30                 |
| 8. Plan of operations includes a prescribed burn after brush management.   | 30                 |
| 9. Plan of operations includes a prescribed burn. However, continuous annual burning will not occur.   | 5                  |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 10. Participant has attended (in the past four years) a one-day grazing management workshop. Workshop curriculum must have included any of the following topics: plant physiology, grazing systems and design, range and pasture ecology, grazing and rangeland health, prescribed burning, forage and livestock balance, forage and resource inventory, soil and grazing resource interaction, and wildlife habitat creation/development/improvement through grazing management. | 15 |
| 11. Participant has attended (in the past four years) a multi-day grazing management school. Workshop curriculum must have included all of the following topics: plant physiology, grazing systems and design, range and pasture ecology, grazing and rangeland health, prescribed burning, forage and livestock balance, forage and resource inventory, soil and grazing resource interaction, and wildlife habitat creation/development/improvement through grazing management. | 20 |